



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,696	04/12/2001	Jerrold L. King	MICR135.02	4676

7590 08/13/2003

Ormiston & McKinney, PLLC
P.O. Box 298 802
W. Bannock, Suite 400
Boise, ID 83701-0298

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JAMES M

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/834,696	KING ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James Mitchell	2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 19,23 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ichiyama et al. (U.S 5,373,190).

4. Ichiyama (Fig 1) discloses a semiconductor chip package comprising a chip (1) conductive leads (8) electrically connected to and extending over a surface of the chip, a continuous body of insulating encapsulating material (4, via epoxy) covering at least a portion of the chip and the body of the encapsulating material fully encapsulating the conductive leads (8) except for the immediate point of contact with the electrodes (13) where the encapsulating material is necessarily displaced to allow the electrode to contact the lead, with the electrode each having a first portion disposed in the

Art Unit: 2827

encapsulating material and contacting a conductive lead and a second portion protruding from the encapsulating material.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ichiyama in combination with Ehata (JP59148352).

8. Ichiyama discloses the elements stated in paragraph 4 and further said chip having in the alternative bond pads (8) with conductive leads (10) attached to the insulating material, wherein each lead is electrically connected to and extending over the bond pad, but does not appear to explicitly disclose that the electrodes are solder

balls having a first portion disposed in the encapsulating material and contacting a conductive lead, and a second portion protruding from the encapsulating material.

9. However, Ehata (Fig 1d) utilizes an electrode solder ball.
10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form the electrode of Ichiyama as solder balls in order to provide electrodes as taught by Ehata (English Constitution).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments file May 27, 2003 have been fully considered but is not persuasive. Applicant contends that the prior art leads are not elongated and do not extend from near the center the chip out past the edge of the chip. Because the limitations argued by applicant are not in claim 19, the argument is deemed moot. The ordinary plain meaning of a lead extending over a chip, which is recited in the claim, encompasses in scope, merely a lead spread over certain distance that covers a portion of the chip; Ichiyama clearly shows those features.

12. As for applicants arguments that bond pad, leads and electrodes are mutually exclusive, a showing by applicant in its drawings that terminals, leads and electrodes are separate components or highlighting that Ichiyama refers to item 8 as an electrode is not persuasive in establishing that the terms are mutually exclusive. It is accepted that applicants can be their own lexicographer, thus a patent or application that calls a lead an electrode or bond pad does not establish that they are mutually exclusive, unless applicant has given the term special meaning beyond their ordinary use. A special definition can only be established when the specification states the meaning that

a term in the claim is intended to have, *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989), which applicant has failed to do. As previously stated, bond pads, electrodes and leads are all merely conductive paths and therefore are not mutually exclusive, absent a special meaning defined by applicant.

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Mitchell whose telephone number is (703) 305-0244. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:30-8:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on (703) 305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

Art Unit: 2827

305-3432 for regular communications and (703) 305-3230 for After Final
communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or
proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-
0956.



jmm

August 3, 2003



DAVID E. GRAYBILL
PRIMARY EXAMINER